

R E M A R K S

The claims were objected to because the amendment filed March 4, 2004, which was sent to the PTO by means of a facsimile transmission was not sufficiently legible. It is hoped that the claims submitted herewith are fully legible. To enhance legibility, the font of the claims is changed to Times New Roman from Ariel, and the line spacing increased to double-space. Should the Examiner wish to have the claims presented in a larger font, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned representative.

The disclosure was objected to with respect to some language at pages 2, 6, 8, and 9. The Examiner's comments regarding pages 6, 8, and 9 are addressed by correcting typographical errors. As for the page 2 comment, applicant respectfully declines to make the suggested change because the phrase "in accord with" means "in conformance with," and it makes perfect sense to use this phrase.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Specifically, in connection with claim 1 the Examiner states that the Examiner is unable to find support for a "memory corresponding to v transmitted symbols." Applicant respectfully traverses. Aside from the fact that claim 1 speaks of n transmitted symbols, and not v transmitted symbols, applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to page 1 of the specification, where it is explained that the transmission channel between the transmitter and the receiver effectively consists of memory (since it takes time for transmitted signals to traverse the distance between the transmitter and the receiver, and during that time a number of discrete transmitted signals may coexist in the channel). The text further explains that this memory can be represented by a FIR filter. Accordingly, it is believed that the specification amply supports the claim 1 of a channel with memory.

In connection with claim 3, the Examiner asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the "of said pre-filter of N_b " phrase. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 defines a pre-filter that is made up of a plurality of FIR filters. Those filters have coefficients. Claim 3, which depends on claim 1, specifies a preprocessor for computing those coefficients. As indicated above, the transmission channel between the

transmitter and the receiver has memory. The transmission channel between the transmitter and the output port of the pre-filter within the receiver also has memory. It is this latter memory that claim 3 is addressing when it specifies that the “effective transmission channel memory” is N_b . To make the claim clearer, the phrase “transmitted symbols” is included (which was not included in the aforementioned March 4, 2004 amendment). Applicant believes that, as currently amended, it is even clearer that claim 3 is in compliance with 35 USC 112.

A number of references were cited of record by the Examiner but were not applied against the claims. Those were perused, and applicant believes that they neither anticipate nor render the subject claims obvious.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully submits that all of the Examiner’s objections and rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Dated: 9/18/04

Respectfully,
Naofal Al-Dhahir

By Henry T. Brendzel
Henry T. Brendzel
Reg. No. 26,844
Phone (973) 467-2025
Fax (973) 467-6589
email brendzel@comcast.net